

Department of Education & Early Development
Teaching & Learning Support

Goldbelt Place
801 West 10th Street, Suite 200
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1894
(907) 465-8691
(907) 465-8400 Fax
mark_leal@eed.state.ak.us

To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

Thru: Ed McLain, Ed.D.
Deputy Commissioner

From: Mark Leal
Director of Assessment and Accountability

Date: December 3, 2002

Subject: 2002/2003 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and School Improvement Sites

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform you of schools in Alaska that, based upon our analysis, did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the 2001/2002 school year. The Department of Education & Early Development is providing this information to assist district Superintendents in meeting the requirement that districts identify, for improvement, schools receiving Title I funds that did not demonstrate AYP. To assist Superintendents with this task, the department has analyzed the data from the Spring 2002 assessments and recommended placements for schools in improvement categories specified under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

We have asked Superintendents to verify this analysis and provide school sites with the opportunity to review the data and the status of their school. The provisions in Section 1116 (b) (2) (A) of NCLB specifies the process for school review, district consideration of evidence, and require districts to make public school improvement sites in their district within 30 days.

Background

Improving America's Schools Act- Since the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act in 1994, districts have had the responsibility of determining whether schools that serve Title I students demonstrate adequate yearly progress. The responsibility of districts to identify schools not demonstrating AYP was included and expanded in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002.

In prior years, the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development has assumed the responsibility for calculating adequate yearly progress and identifying schools for improvement that do not demonstrate adequate yearly progress for two years. In 1996, the department developed a definition for adequate yearly progress in the state of Alaska. That definition was:

Schools with eleven or more students taking the CAT-5, where 61% or more of the students are not at the proficient or advanced level, will be considered to have NOT made adequate yearly progress under Title I. Proficient and advanced levels require that students answer 50% or more of the CAT-5 items correctly.

Over the years this definition was applied to CAT-5 results from Grades 4, 8, and 11. Due to changes in the state assessment program, in the past two years the AYP definition was only applied to CAT-5 results from students in Grade 4.

No Child Left Behind Act- With the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Congress reaffirmed the AYP provisions, established a more prescriptive method for calculating AYP, and increased and formalized the sanctions that must be applied to schools serving Title I students that do not demonstrate AYP. It was the intent of the Congress that the passage of NCLB would continue and extend the provisions of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. To this end, provisions of NCLB specifically indicate that schools identified for improvement under the Improving America's Schools Act would carry forward with the passage of NCLB.

In July, the Department of Education & Early Development published a list of School Improvement Sites. This list identified the schools in improvement status based on the Spring 2001 assessment results. In the fall, the U.S. Department of Education informed states that districts were required to identify schools for improvement for the 2002/2003 school year based upon Spring 2002 assessment results.

Because the department elected to replace the CAT-5 with the TerraNova CAT/6, it was necessary for the department to develop an interim definition of adequate yearly progress that will be applied to the Spring 2002 assessment results. The interim definition developed by the department for the current year is:

Schools with eleven or more students taking the TerraNova CAT/6 at grades 4, 5, 7, and 9, where 61% or more of the students are not at the proficient or advanced level, will be considered to have NOT made adequate yearly progress under Title I. Proficient and advanced levels require that students answer 50% or more of the TerraNova CAT/6 items correctly.

Assessment results will be aggregated across subjects and grade levels. This definition will apply for the 2002/2003 school year only.

No Child Left Behind requires that districts identify schools receiving Title I funds that do not demonstrate AYP, provide parent notification, and implement choice provisions prior to the start of each school year. In the first year of implementation of NCLB, a number of states, including Alaska, were not able to identify schools prior to the start of the 2002/2003 school year. According to guidance received from the U.S. Department of Education, states that did not identify schools using data from the 2001/2002 school year must identify schools receiving Title I funds that do not demonstrate AYP, provide notification to parents, and provide choice "no later than the beginning of the next term during the 2002/2003 school year."

The department is also required to develop a long-term definition of adequate yearly progress as specified in the No Child Left Behind Act. This definition will be calculated using the Spring 2002 assessment results and will establish the threshold for the statewide school accountability plan. Current plans are to release this definition in early February 2003.

Preliminary List of Alaska Schools Not Demonstrating AYP in SY 2001/2002

Schools Not Demonstrating AYP- Year 1- Based upon assessment data provided to the department, it appears that the following schools in Alaska did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress in 2002. If this data is correct, schools on this list have not demonstrated adequate yearly progress for one year. While no sanctions or consequences apply to these schools for this year, in many ways this list constitutes a list of schools in warning status. It is important to note that if a school on this list does not demonstrate adequate yearly progress on assessments administered in the Spring of 2003, that school will be identified as a first year school improvement site at the start of the 2003/2004 school year.

District Name	School Name	District Name	School Name
Alaska Gateway	Walter Northway School	Lower Kuskokwim	Lewis Angapak Memorial School
Anchorage	Mountain View Elementary	Lower Kuskokwim	Nelson Island Area Schools
Anchorage	Whaley Center	Lower Kuskokwim	Nightmute School
Bering Strait	Aniguiin School	Lower Kuskokwim	Paul T. Albert Memorial School
Bering Strait	Anthony A. Andrews School	Lower Kuskokwim	Rocky Mountain School
Bering Strait	Brevig Mission School	Lower Kuskokwim	William Miller Memorial School
Bering Strait	Gambell School	Lower Yukon	Emmonak School
Bering Strait	Shaktoolik School	Lower Yukon	Marshall School
Chatham Schools	Angoon School	Lower Yukon	Pitkas Point School
Iditarod	David-Louis School	Lower Yukon	Russian Mission School
Iditarod	Innoko River School	Lower Yukon	Scammon Bay School
Kenai Peninsula	Tebughna School	Lower Yukon	Sheldon Point School
Kodiak Island	Ouzinkie School	North Slope	Kali School
Kuspuk	Crow Village Sam School	North Slope	Nuiqsut Trapper School
Kuspuk	George Morgan Jr/Sr H.S.	North Slope	Nunamiut School
Kuspuk	Johnnie John Sr. School	Northwest Arctic	Ambler School
Lake & Peninsula	Kokhanok School	Northwest Arctic	Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary
Lake & Peninsula	Nondalton School	Northwest Arctic	Buckland School
Lake & Peninsula	Perryville School	Northwest Arctic	Kiana School

District Name	School Name	District Name	School Name
Lower Kuskokwim	Akiuk Memorial School	Northwest Arctic	Kobuk School
Lower Kuskokwim	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School	Northwest Arctic	McQueen School
Lower Kuskokwim	Dick R Kiunya Memorial	Northwest Arctic	Shungnak School
Lower Kuskokwim	Joann A. Alexie Memorial School	Southwest Region	Manokotak School
Lower Kuskokwim	Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat	Yukon/Koyukuk	Kaltag School
Lower Kuskokwim	Kwigillingok School	Yupit	Akiak School

First Year School Improvement Status- Based upon assessment data provided to the department, it appears that the following schools in Alaska did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress in 2002. If this data is correct, the following schools have not demonstrated adequate yearly progress for two years. Schools in this category are considered first year school improvement sites. Under NCLB, first year school improvement sites are required to develop a school improvement plan within three months after identification, provide school choice beginning at the start of the second term, and provide information to parents. It is important to note that if a first year school improvement site does not demonstrate adequate yearly progress on assessments administered in the Spring of 2003, that school will be identified as a second year school improvement site at the start of the 2003/2004 school year.

District Name	School Name
Bering Strait	Koyuk-Malemute School
Kuspuk	Zachar Levi School
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Ayaprun Elitnaurvik School
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Chaptnguak School
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Z. J. Williams School
Lower Yukon Schools	Alakanuk School
Lower Yukon Schools	Kotlik School
Southwest Region Schools	Chief Ivan Blunka School
Yupit Schools	Tuluksak School

Second Year School Improvement Status- Based upon assessment data provided to the department, it appears that the following school in Alaska did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress in 2002. If this data is correct, the following school did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress for three years. Schools in this category are considered second year school improvement sites. Under NCLB, second year school improvement sites are required to revise or continue to implement a school improvement plan, continue to provide school choice, provide supplemental services at the start of the second term, and provide information to parents. It is important to note that if a second year school improvement site does not demonstrate adequate yearly progress on assessments administered in the Spring of 2003, that school will be identified as a Corrective site at the start of the 2003/2004 school year.

District Name	School Name
Bering Strait Schools	Turkurngailnguq School
Bering Strait Schools	Hogarth Kingeekuk School
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Chief Paul School
Lower Kuskokwim Schools	Ket'achik Aapaaluk Memorial School
Lower Yukon Schools	Hooper Bay School
Lower Yukon Schools	Pilot Station School
Northwest Arctic Borough Schools	Davis-Ramoth School
Yupiit Schools	Akichak School

Opportunity to Review School Data, District Requirement to make Final Determination

Section 1116 (b) (2) (A) of NCLB specifies that schools identified under any of these provisions be afforded the opportunity to review the school-level data on which the proposed identification is based. If a principal or a majority of the parents of students enrolled in the school believe that the proposed identification is in error for statistical or other substantive reasons, they may provide supporting evidence to the Superintendent. The district is required to make public a final determination on the status of a school not later than 30 days after providing the school with the opportunity to review the school level data. As part of the public notification process, the department is requiring that districts notify the department regarding the status of schools identified in this memorandum no later than December 20, 2002.

cc: Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D., Commissioner
PJ Ford, Director, TLS
Barbara Thompson, Deputy Director, TLS
Eric Madsen, Education Administrator II, TLS